



AP 5

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>		Application No.	09/823,616
		Filing Date	March 31, 2001
		First Named Inventor	Simon Knee
		Art Unit	2143
		Examiner Name	Bilgrami, A.
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	6	Attorney Docket Number	42390P9020

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> PTO/SB/08 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Filing Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration/POA <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;">Return postcard</div>
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Gordon R. Lindeen III, Reg. No. 33,192 BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Signature	
Date	July 11, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.			
Typed or printed name	Debbie Casias		
Signature		Date	July 11, 2007



Our Docket No. 42390P9020

Patent

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re the Patent Application of:)	
)	
Knee et al.)	
)	
Serial No.: 09/823,616)	Art Unit: 2413
)	
Filed: March 21, 2001)	
)	Examiner: A. Bilgrami
For: First Classless Inter-Domain Routing)	
(CIDR) Lookups)	
)	
)	
)	

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

**REPLY BRIEF
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL
TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Sir:

Applicant (hereafter "Appellant") hereby submits this Brief in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed June 15, 2007 in the above-captioned case. The present Examiner's Answer appears to present the same substantive arguments as the Examiner's previous answer of February 24, 2006. Appellant respectfully reiterates its previous reply herein as well as its request for consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for allowance of the above-captioned patent application.

An oral hearing is not desired.

I. INTRODUCTION

Sections 1-5 and 8 of the Examiner's Answer do not raise any issues and Section 6 reiterates the outstanding rejection. This Reply Brief will accordingly be addressed to Section 9 only. Section 9 is divided into Issue 1 and Issue 2 and Appellant addresses them in the order presented by the Examiner.

II. Issue 1: Paragraph 61 was addressed in the Appeal Brief and, like Paragraph 73, does not disclose the salient limitations of Claim 1

It would appear that Appellant misunderstood the Examiner's rejection as relying on paragraph 73 of Hunter, rather than on paragraph 61 of Hunter. Appellant apologizes for any resulting confusion. Appellant certainly was not ignoring paragraph 61 and would refer the board to the detailed discussion of paragraph 61 in Appellant's brief that begins on page 6, line 21.

Returning to Claim 1, Appellant believes that paragraph 61 is cited as showing, "retrieving an encoded mask vector from a mask table, the encoded mask vector corresponding to an address of the search key" as set forth in Claim 1.

Looking at paragraph 61 (describing Figure 6), "hash index generation is performed at step 620 based upon a mask and a [received] masked search key." In the next step, the "hash bin identified by the index is searched for an entry matching the masked search key at step 630." It would appear that entries in the hash bin have a mask length that must be "less than or equal to the search key's mask." Finally, this paragraph includes, "the masked search key must be equivalent to the address information associated with the [hash bin] entry."

Appellants are uncertain, but it would appear that the Examiner is suggesting:

- 1) that the hash bin is the same as the claimed mask table,
- 2) that the hash bin entries are the same as the encoded mask vectors, and
- 3) that the equivalent associated address information for the hash bin entry is the same as the claimed encoded mask vector correspondence to an address of the search key.

Even with all these equivalences, if indeed, this is what the Examiner is suggesting, the actual process specifically set forth in Claim 1 does not correspond to what happens in Hunter.

On page 7 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant made several observations about paragraph 61. These do not appear to be addressed by the Examiner's Answer. These points would include, 1) Hunter does not retrieve an encoded mask vector, 2) Hunter does not determine a set of masks, 3) Hunter does not use an encoded mask vector, 4) Hunter does not form a routing table query based upon the search key and a mask of the set of masks, 5) Hunter does not apply such a routing table query to the routing table.

While the Examiner has pointed out an error in Appellant's reference to paragraph 73, Appellant's do not find an answer to the five points made on page 7 of the Appeal Brief.

III. Issue 2: Paragraphs 33 and 48 do not provide the teachings missing from paragraph 61.

The Examiner here appears to be concerned that Appellant failed to appreciate the significance of paragraphs 33 and 48 in Hunter especially as they pertain to the penultimate paragraph of Claim 1. Appellant apologizes for any confusion caused by this misunderstanding. Appellant, having now reviewed these two paragraphs more closely, still fails to see any particular significance. In addition, these two paragraphs do not address any of the five points made above.

The relevant portion of Claim 1 would appear to be "forming a routing table query based upon the search key and a mask of the set of masks, indicated by the encoded mask vector to be the longest mask of the set of masks."

Paragraph 33 provides an overview of the process of Hunter and refers, in reverse order, to "generating a hash table index based upon... a current mask" and to locating a longest match by "progressively shortening a mask."

Paragraph 48 goes into more detail but there does not appear to be any more information about the actual search process than was provided in paragraph 61 et seq. Appellant still does not see a set of masks, encoded mask vectors, nor one mask being indicated by the encoded mask vector to be the longest mask of the set of masks.

IV. CONCLUSION


The outstanding rejection is for anticipation. Accordingly, the Examiner must show that each and every element of, e.g., Claim 1 is shown or at least suggested by the one reference, Hunter. While Hunter performs a longest match search, Claim 1 includes specific recitations about how such a search is done. The two approaches are simply different even if the results could be the same.

Accordingly, Appellant maintains that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: July 11, 2007



Gordon R. Lindén III
Attorney for Appellant
Registration Number: 33,192

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980